

Appendix

Tom Connally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in one of our well-known and widely read newspapers, the New Bedford Standard-Times, about our late colleague and most respected Senator, Tom Connally. It shows the regard in which he was held in Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOM CONNALLY

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during World War I and its aftermath, Thomas Terry Connally became an international figure, but remained in many respects what he said he was when he first went to Congress in 1917—a "country lawyer."

He listed himself in the Congressional Directory simply as "Tom Connally." He liked to season a serious speech on foreign affairs with the homely phrases of his native Texas.

Speaking as the statesman, he said before war came to the United States in 1941 that this country should "maintain a policy of resistance to conquest of democratic countries by dictators * * *." Then, as a Texan, he put the same thought another way by adding no nation should be allowed to become "too big for its britches."

Yet he was in no sense provincial. It was Connally who gave heavily of his time for more than 4 years to promoting Franklin D. Roosevelt's dream of a world organization to keep the peace. Due in large measure to Connally's leadership, the issue of American membership in the subsequently formed United Nations was taken out of politics. He went to the San Francisco conference which in the spring of 1945 framed the U.N. Charter and helped to obtain the Senate's ratification—with only two adverse votes.

But Connally, who was a "firm believer in the world security system," who was willing to give it every chance, nevertheless was a realist as well as a staunch protector of his country's rights.

As the dreams for world peace faded before the onslaught of cold war and Iron Curtain tactics, the Texan told his Senate colleagues it was "imperative that the United States maintain an adequate Army, a superior Navy and a superlative Air Force"—for defense and for sustaining "our international rights and obligations."

In this same frame of mind, Mr. Connally was sufficiently perceptive to sense the abyss between hope and truth in international affairs. The same Senator who was a leading fighter to give the U.N. an opportunity to prove itself realized the United States required protection from foreign laws as well as from foreign tanks, if either was against our best interests.

Accordingly, he sponsored an amendment concerning American adherence to the World Court at The Hague. This restricts court jurisdiction involving the United States to those cases that the U.S. Senate decides the Court is competent to judge. Connally guided this reservation through the Senate; it bears his name and is a fitting monument to the outstanding "country lawyer" who served his country long and well.

The Vulnerability of Our Land-Based Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the October 1963 issue of Navy magazine:

The Senate has advised and consented to the limited nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union by a vote of 80 to 19. Sixty-six votes were needed for ratification.

The agreement, which permits only underground nuclear explosions, is now the law of the land. There is, therefore, only academic interest in the observation by some critics that (1) the pact might have failed of ratification if all the uneasy Senators had not voted for it on the ground that to do otherwise would embarrass the United States because the President had already signed it and (2) there would have been no treaty at all if the Senate had been asked to advise and consent to its signing before the event.

But the Senate debate focused some (alas, not nearly enough) attention on a problem of transcendent importance to the national security. This matter concerns the vulnerability of our land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's), the Atlases, Titans, and Minutemen.

WE JUST DON'T KNOW

Briefly, the problem involves these considerations:

The Russians have exploded very large hydrogen bombs—up to 60 megatons or 60 million tons of TNT equivalent and American officials concede they can build them up to 100 megatons or more. We are not certain what effect such monster bombs will have on our radars, underground missiles and control and firing posts because we have never exploded weapons that large and the treaty now bars us from doing so.

Last year, when President Kennedy was explaining why we had to resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere, he put it this way:

"We are spending great sums of money on radar to alert our defenses and develop anti-missile systems—on the communications which enable our command and control centers to direct a response—on hardening our missile sites, shielding our missiles and warheads from defensive action, and providing them with electronic guidance systems to find their targets.

"But we cannot be certain how much of the preparation will turn out to be useless, blacked out, paralyzed or destroyed by the complex effects of nuclear explosion."

Mr. Kennedy's statement was made on March 2, 1962, before he or any other Westerner knew of the Soviet plan to build and test monster bombs later in the year. Accordingly, what he said then might be said now with the same persuasiveness. In fact, we discovered more about a phenomenon called electromagnetic pulse, a heavy surge of energy generated by nuclear explosions, in our 1962 tests. Some scientists and military men fear that EMP, as it is called, has the capability to deactivate our missiles in their silos by fusing electronic circuits and agitating the delicate electronic components. No one at the Pentagon can say for sure that it doesn't. The following comment by Missiles and Rockets magazine may, therefore, be properly in order:

"It could mean that the United States has invested billions of dollars in a maginot line of Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman missiles which could be rendered harmless by the new Soviet development.

What is the Pentagon planning to do about this threat to the larger part of our deterrent/retaliatory missile force—the stuffed-in-concrete portion? According to Dr. Harold Brown, Deputy Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, the Pentagon will "design around our uncertainties." And what does that mean? Principally this: We will spend more millions for more radars, missiles, and silos and a new fire-control system which would allow us to launch our land-based rockets from an airplane.

It seems to us that there is a more sensible, less, expensive way of solving the vulnerability problem and it is distressing that the land-oriented leaders of the Defense Department haven't discovered it. (Senator HENRY JACKSON of Washington has, we are happy to relate.) It is, simply, to transfer more of our strategic missile deterrent to the security of the seas. This means more Polaris submarines. It means putting Polaris aboard surface warships—as we are asking NATO to do; it means we should develop larger warheads for new seaborne rockets.

WE NEED A "MIX" BUT—

We do not advocate that all our ballistic missiles be seaborne. We should have a "mix" of ship-based and land-based rockets although, in our opinion, the latter should be of the mobile, less-vulnerable variety.

But commonsense dictates that the far larger portion should be moving about and hidden in the 70 percent of the earth's surface that is blue water rather than embedded in concrete in the 2 percent occupied by the United States.

Despite the economic and political considerations that unquestionably enter into such matters, some day the American people, who have been told over and over again that we will not shoot first, will rise up and demand to know why we are putting so many big, juicy targets in our homeland—targets which can only draw a rain of thermonuclear death and firestorms in case of war.

We hope that on Navy Day, 1963, when many Americans will be thinking about "seapower for the seventies" and "the four-ocean challenge," that our top Defense Department civilians will ponder the map of the world,

A6843

A6844

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

November 4

take note of the vast areas of blue and then reconsider the composition of our strategic missile forces.

Early Supporter Now Doubts ARA's Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Area Redevelopment Act amendments of 1963 were defeated in the House in June of this year by a vote of 209 to 204. Subsequently, another bill providing further authorizations for this program passed in the other body and an amended version of the Senate bill has been favorably reported out of the House Banking and Currency Committee and is now awaiting action by the House Rules Committee.

Because of the current interest in ARA, the comments and conclusions of one who is knowledgeable on this subject, who earlier supported the ARA program, but now describes it as a "futile attempt to help too many communities," should be of interest to all Members. I, therefore, include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Sunday, November 3, 1963, edition of the Washington Post entitled "Early Supporter Now Doubts ARA's Value," by Julius Duschka, staff reporter of the Post, in which he discusses the criticism of ARA by Sar A. Levitan, research professor of labor economics at George Washington University.

The article follows:

EARLY SUPPORTER NOW DOUBTS ARA'S VALUE
(By Julius Duschka)

An early supporter of depressed area legislation has sharply criticized the program for "its futile attempt to help too many communities."

The criticism came from Sar A. Levitan, research professor of labor economics at George Washington University.

Levitan raises serious questions about the 2-year-old program in a just-completed book-length study of it financed by the Ford Foundation.

The Area Redevelopment Administration was set up by Congress in 1961 to provide loans and grants to help bring industry and jobs to such areas as southern West Virginia and eastern Kentucky where unemployment is chronic.

The \$389 million depressed areas program was the first major economic legislation proposed by the Kennedy administration. It also was one of the first major pieces of legislation approved by Congress after Mr. Kennedy took office in 1961.

Last June the House defeated legislation providing an additional \$455 million for the depressed areas program. Although the Senate approved the additional funds 2 weeks after the House vote, no effort to try to pass the program in the House in expected before next year.

Levitan attributes the House defeat of the legislation largely to a feeling among many Representatives that the program has been administered on a political basis.

But Levitan's principal criticism of the program is that it has spread too thin what he considers an "extremely limited * * * package of tools."

He notes that more than a third of the Nation's 3,100 counties are eligible for ARA aid. Many counties were brought into the program because of provisions put into the legislation to get votes for it from southern Senators and Representatives from States with declining rural populations.

Levitan notes that one of the original justifications for the ARA was that it would provide jobs and industry for declining communities where public facilities were going to waste and were deteriorating.

"But," he adds, "more than half of the designated ARA larger areas, with a labor force of more than 15,000, have experienced a growth in population between 1950 and 1960."

"Similarly, the population of a third of the smaller designated areas * * * increased between 1950 and 1960, despite the fact that many of these areas are predominantly rural and would be expected to reflect the sharp decline in agricultural employment."

Levitan goes on to note that "not all depressed communities can be saved."

He says "the solution for most of the unemployment in depressed areas whose resource base has been depleted may lie in equipping the unemployed with skills which would be marketable in other areas."

"Many resource-based depressed communities," he adds, "are located in isolated areas where new economic activity can be introduced only at prohibitive costs. Other depressed areas, particularly rural, have never developed an adequate economic base and the social capital invested in such areas is normally insignificant."

Levitan concludes that "a depressed area program can be effective only when the number of depressed areas is reduced to manageable proportions and only areas with a potential for development at a reasonable economic cost are made eligible to participate in the program."

He suggests that preferential tax treatment be given companies that move to depressed areas. Only in this way, he argues, will "blue chip" companies be persuaded to move to these areas.

Levitan also believes that Federal grant-in-aid programs should give special consideration to depressed areas.

Budget Makers Are Not Budget Cutters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the tax bill, many eloquent speeches were made by proponents of the bill expressing the need for making a choice between two roads. The House and the American people were told that if we passed this tax bill we were placing our reliance on the private sector of the economy and rejecting the pump-priming operations of the public sector. In addition, we were told that the President had on at least three separate occasions joined in this Magna Carta of fiscal responsibility. To substantiate this, a letter to Chairman MILLS, of the Ways and Means Committee, signed by

the President was revealed for all to see.

Apparently this much-talked-about noble pledge does not extend to the Kennedy budgetmakers. A recent article appearing in the November 1 issue of the Wall Street Journal gives all of us who are economy minded cause for alarm. The article stated:

BUDGET MAKERS ARE NOT BUDGET CUTTERS

Budget makers slyly shape spending plans to avoid wrecking tax cut chances.

They figure the tax bill will still be pending when the budget goes to Congress in January; conservatives will rebel unless spending boosts are limited. So policymakers warn agencies that big new job-creating projects must be kept out of the original budget. They promise to seek extra funds for some later on, when the tax bill is out of the way.

Kennedy men sweat as lawmakers try to pin down their stand on big new public works outlays now. Officials try to assure liberal Democrats they favor antiunemployment projects generally, but within Kennedy's promised budget hold down. The administration holds careful briefing sessions before Capitol hearings, to make sure all its witnesses get the delicate line straight.

Approach of 1964 elections promises to sharpen tax cut versus spending disputes among Congress Democrats. Kennedy strategists fear embarrassing clamor by liberals for bigger job-creating outlays.

Salute to a Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal characteristics of despotic, authoritarian governments is the secrecy in which they shroud their operations.

And a fundamental, vital trait of democratic governments is their willingness to make available to the people and the press detailed information about their operations.

In recent years, we have observed an ominous trend in our Federal Government, a trend typified by bureaucrats in the executive branch who crouch behind the public information section of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 to withhold information from the Congress, from the press and from the people of this country.

A recognized leader in the fight for freedom of information, so essential to our democratic processes, is the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the Honorable EDWARD V. LONG. Senator LONG has introduced legislation which would amend the Administrative Procedure Act to clarify and preserve the right of the public to information about their Government.

An outstanding newspaper in my congressional district, the St. Joseph, Mo., Gazette, recently paid editorial tribute to Senator LONG for his efforts to protect the citizen's fundamental right to know what his Government is doing and under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial: